

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

UNPUBLISHED
December 1, 2011

In the Matter of S. DAVIS, Minor.

No. 303391
Allegan Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 10-047659-NA

Before: JANSEN, P.J., and SAWYER and SHAPIRO, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Respondent K. Flores appeals as of right from a circuit court order terminating her parental rights to the minor child. We affirm.

Contrary to what respondent argues, the record does not indicate that the trial court relied on MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i) or (c)(ii) as statutory bases for termination. Rather, the trial court's discussion of abandonment indicates that the court found that termination was warranted under MCL 712A.19b(3)(a)(ii). We find no clear error in the trial court's decision. *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000); *In re Utrera*, 281 Mich App 1, 16-17; 761 NW2d 253 (2008); MCR 3.977(E)(3) and (K). The evidence showed that respondent has a history of substance abuse and mental health issues, and left the child with others when the child was just a few months old. While the child had been in Michigan since October 2010, respondent moved around the country and refused to provide an address where she could be reached. She had no contact with the child, did not appear for any court hearings, and showed no interest in reunification efforts.

Further, considering respondent's lack of involvement with the child and refusal to participate in court proceedings or services for reunification, the trial court did not clearly err in finding that termination of her parental rights was in the child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich at 356-357.

Although respondent summarily asserts that termination was improper because she did not receive notice of the various court hearings and was not provided with services for reunification, she has not presented any meaningful argument or cited any appropriate authority in support of these assertions. Accordingly, we deem these issues abandoned. *Berger v Berger*, 277 Mich App 700, 712; 747 NW2d 336 (2008); *Woods v SLB Prop Mgt, LLC*, 277 Mich App 622, 626; 750 NW2d 228 (2008). A party cannot "announce a position or assert an error and then leave it up to this Court to discover and rationalize the basis for his claims, or unravel and elaborate for him his arguments, and then search for authority either to sustain or reject his

position.” *Mitcham v Detroit*, 355 Mich 182, 203; 94 NW2d 388 (1959). We note, however, that the evidence showed that respondent frequently moved around the country and refused to provide addresses where she could be reached. The record indicates that respondent was served by mail and by publication, the propriety of which respondent does not challenge. Further, the record clearly shows that respondent was aware of the proceedings and was encouraged to participate in services, but she refused to return to Michigan, would not participate in the court hearings, and did not maintain contact with the agency. Accordingly, no basis for relief is apparent.

Affirmed.

/s/ Kathleen Jansen
/s/ David H. Sawyer
/s/ Douglas B. Shapiro